

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-4 are pending in the application. Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-4 define patentable subject matter.

As set forth in the February 12, 2004 Office Action, claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rangan (U.S. Patent No. 6,412,073).

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended independent claims 1-3 to improve clarity.

Independent claim 1 now recites:

said retrieval server of said information retrieval site is configured to retrieve from a plurality of information providing sites data providing detailed information regarding similar services respectively provided by said information providing sites, store in said retrieval database the data providing the detailed information regarding the similar services which is retrieved from said information providing sites, retrieve from said retrieval database the data providing the detailed information regarding the similar services in response to information-retrieval input information received by said information retrieval site from an information terminal, and transmit to said information terminal said data providing the detailed information which is retrieved from said retrieval database so as to cause a monitor of said information terminal to display said data providing the detailed information regarding the similar services respectively provided by said information providing sites in a comparative manner.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention would not have been anticipated by or rendered obvious in view of Rangan because the cited reference does not teach or suggest the claimed retrieval server configured to retrieve from a plurality of information

providing sites data providing detailed information regarding similar services respectively provided by said information providing sites, [and] store the data retrieved from said information providing sites in said retrieval database ...”, as required by amended claim 1.

As shown in Fig. 1, Rangan discloses an Internet portal system 11 including an Internet service provider (ISP) 15 for providing personalized web pages. The ISP 15 includes a mass storage repository 29 for storing the personalized web pages and a server 31 for retrieving the personalized web pages stored in the mass storage repository 29. As shown in Fig. 2, the server 31, in response to an access request by a subscriber (e.g., terminal 14), presents the subscriber with a personalized web page which includes usernames, passwords and website Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) or hyperlinks corresponding webpages provided by a plurality of Internet servers (e.g., Internet servers 23, 25 and 27).

With regard to independent claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Rangan discloses the claimed retrieval server via the server 31 and the claimed retrieval database via the mass storage repository 29. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the website URLs (e.g., LBC.com, MyBank.com, MyStocks.com, Myshopping.com, Mortgage.com and Airline.com as displayed in Fig. 2), stored in the mass storage repository 29 and displayed on the personalized WEB page, are information indicative of services provided by the websites. That is, the Examiner takes the position that “the website “MyBank.com” is information indicative of a banking service” and “[t]he website “Airline.com” is information indicative of an airline service.”¹

¹ February 12, 2004 Office Action at page 3.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that the website URLs are not “data providing detailed information regarding similar services respectively provided by said information providing sites”, as required by claim 1. Rather, the website URLs are simply the names of or hyperlinks to the websites which can only be used to identify and locate the corresponding websites, and do not “provid[e] detailed information regarding similar services respectively provided by” the websites.

Further, a subscriber cannot specifically know the services (e.g., services showing the rate of interest, providing bank transfers or dealing exchange) provided by a website having the name “MyBank.com”, even if the website belongs to a bank. For example, the website URL “MyBank.com” may correspond to a website which does not provide any services, such as website of a person who simply opens his banking records to public or a business that simply lists its address and contact information on the website. Likewise, the website URL “Airline.com” may correspond to a website which provides airline reservation services, air courier services, aviation industry news, airline training, or airline service quality evaluations, such that it is not possible to know which services, if any, are provided based on the website URL. Similarly, it is not possible to know whether any services are provided, or details of services, provided by a website having a URL name “LBC.com”.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Rangan does not teach or suggest the server 31 is configured to retrieve from a plurality of information providing sites data providing detailed information regarding similar services respectively provided by the information providing sites and store the data providing the detailed information regarding the similar

services which is retrieved from the information providing sites in the mass storage repository

29. In particular, nowhere does Rangan teach or suggest that the server 31 retrieves from the Internet servers (websites) 23, 25 and 27 the website names (URLs) which is displayed on the personalized web pages. That is, in order to create or modify a personalized web page providing the website URLs, a subscriber would simply specify/enter the particular website URLs to be presented on the personalized web page at the time the personalized web page is created or modified. The server 31 does not retrieve the website URLs (which are names/locations of the websites rather than data representing details of services provided by the websites) from the websites since the server 31 would need to know the website URLs before the server 31 could even access the websites. In other words, the server 31 would need to be provided with the website URLs by the subscriber in order to list the website URLs on the personalized web page.

Lastly, Applicant respectfully submits that Rangan does not teach or suggest the server 31 is configured to “transmit to said information terminal said data providing the detailed information which is retrieved from said retrieval database so as to cause a monitor of said information terminal to display said data providing the detailed information regarding the similar services respectively provided by said information providing sites in a comparative manner”, as claimed. Rather, as discussed above, Rangan simply discloses providing to a subscriber a personalized web page which includes hyperlinks/URLs for different webpages.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, as well as dependent claims 2-4, should be allowable because the cited reference does not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114
USSN: 09/731,706

Q61797

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher R. Lipp
Registration No. 41,157

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 14, 2004